

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/690,289	10/21/2003	Sheila Shaw	SS-101.P.1	4575	
24232	7590 09/14/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
DAVID R PRESTON & ASSOCIATES			THOMPSON, KATHRYN L		
12625 HIGH SUITE 205	BLUFF DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN DIEGO	, CA 92130		3763		
			DATE MAILED: 09/14/200-	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/690,289	SHAW, SHEILA	\mathcal{M}
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kathryn L. Thompson	3763	·
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	th the correspondence add	dress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirty of will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT ute, cause the application to become ABA	eply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely (HS from the mailing date of this co ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/	<u>/21/03</u> .		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ Th	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin			
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ad			•
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			:D 4 404(d)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prapplication from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Objections

Claims 1-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant positively recites a security band that is not detachable. Examiner respectfully disagrees and believes that Applicant's security band can be detachable. For example, if one were to take a pair of scissors and cut the band, it would become detachable. Unless Applicant states how the band is not susceptible to becoming detached, Examiner cannot see how Applicant's band is not able to be detached with a pair of scissors or any other cutting means. One possibility could be that the user of the band him/herself decides whether he/she wants the band to be detachable. If this were to be the case, then for purposes of the prior art rejection, Examiner interprets not detachable to mean whether the user wants to detach the band or not. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Blair (US 5,304,145), Chandler (US 5,468,229) (Column 2, Line 25), Bennes et al (US

Art Unit: 3763

5,853,396), Sutherland et al (US 6,126,639) (Column 3, Line 58), Lee (6,436,074) (Column 3, Line 26), and McDaniel (US 6,544,232). The prior art discloses a peritoneal dialysis security band comprising an elastic band, a catheter retaining pocket positioned along a portion of said elastic band, wherein said pocket is able to accept a catheter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blair,
Chandler, Bennes et al, Sutherland et al, Lee, and McDaniel. The prior art does not
disclose expressly that the elastic band has a width from about 3 inches to about 6
inches. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of
design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the band from about 3 to 6
inches in width because Applicant has not disclosed that these dimensions provides an
advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary
skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform
equally well with either the dimensions taught by the prior art or the claimed 3 to 6
inches because both dimensions perform the same function equally well. Therefore, it
would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the prior art to obtain the
invention as specified in Claim 7.

Application/Control Number: 10/690,289

Art Unit: 3763

Conclusion

Page 4

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn L. Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-3286. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM: 1st Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 703-308-3552. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KLT

.

NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINA

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700